DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 159 844 EC 112 157

TITLE	Report and Recommendations of the National Advisory Committee on Child Abuse and Neglect. Report No. 108.
INSTITUTION	Education Commission of the States, Denver, Colo.
SPONS AGENCY	National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect (DHEW/OHD), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Apr 78
NOTE	22p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Education Commission of the States, Suite 300, 1860 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colorado 80295 ($2.50)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Child Abuse; Conference Reports; *Federal Legislation; *Government Role; *Neglected Children; *Policy Formation; *State Legislation

ABSTRACT

The report highlights the first 2 years' activities of the National Advisory Committee on Child Abuse and Neglect and presents to education decision makers the committee's recommendations concerning legislation and policy. Suggestions are offered to four specific audiences: federal government, state governments, education governing agencies at all levels, and the Education Commission of the States. Among the recommendations made are that the states be encouraged to include parenting education in their plans for career education, that appropriations to child protective service agencies be increased; and that inservice training be provided to school personnel who are expected to report suspected child abuse and neglect. (SBH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED159844

Report and Recommendations of the National Advisory Committee on Child Abuse and Neglect

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Report No. 108

From the ECS Child Abuse Project

This report was approved by the ECS Steering Committee at its meeting on April 7, 1978, in Albuquerque, N.M.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sally V. Allen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Education Commission of the States
Denver, Colorado 80295
Warren G. Hill, Executive Director

April 1978

Additional copies of this report may be obtained from the Education Commission of the States, Suite 300, 1860 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colorado 80295, (303) 861-4917. For each report send $2.50. This price includes postage and handling. Prepayment required.

EC 112157

Members of the ECS National Advisory Committee on Child Abuse and Neglect

The Honorable Robert F. Bennett
Governor of Kansas
Chairperson

The Honorable Lowell Thomas Jr.
Lieutenant Governor of Alaska
Vice-Chairperson

Eleanor McGovern
Board of Directors, Psychiatric Institute Foundation
Washington, D.C.
Deputy Vice-Chairperson

Grace Baisinger
President, National Congress of Parents and Teachers
Washington, D.C.

Elizabeth Bowen
Wife of Governor Otis R. Bowen
Indianapolis, Indiana

M. Elizabeth Chitty
Board of Education
Plainfield, New Jersey

The Honorable Robert Davis
State Representative and Chairman
Government Operations Committee
Chattanooga, Tennessee

Vincent DeFrancis
Director, American Humane Association, Children's Division
Denver, Colorado

Brian Fraser
Executive Director, National Committee for the Prevention of Child Abuse
Chicago, Illinois

Frederick C. Green, M.D.
Associate Director, Children's Hospital
Washington, D.C.

J. Floyd Hall
Superintendent, Greenville County School District
Greenville, South Carolina

John Himelrick
Director, Interagency Council for Child Development Services
Office of the Governor
Charleston, West Virginia

Donald F. Kline
Chairman, Department of Special Education
Utah State University
Logan, Utah

Pam S. Levin
Vice-President, Citizens' Committee for Children of New York, Inc.
New York, New York

Leila Lewis
Consultant, Pupil Personnel Services, State Department of Education
Boise, Idaho

The Honorable Anne Lindeman
State Senator
Phoenix, Arizona

The Honorable Jan Meyers
State Senator
Overland Park, Kansas

Ruth Myers
Member, Board of Education
Duluth, Minnesota

Edward C. Pomeroy
Executive Director, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
Washington, D.C.

The Reverend Paul C. Reinert, S.J.
Chancellor, St. Louis University
St. Louis, Missouri

The Honorable Lisa Richette
Judge, Court of Common Pleas
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

The Honorable Kenneth Rothman
State Representative
Clayton, Missouri

Barbara J. Sabol
Director, Division of Services to Children and Youth
State Department of Social and Rehabilitative Services
Topeka, Kansas

Richard L. Schiefelbusch
Director, Bureau of Child Research
University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas

Carl Scott
Associate Executive Director, Council on Social Work Education
New York, New York

Gene Sell
Assistant Principal, Campbell County High School
Alexandria, Kentucky

Donna J. Stone
President, National Committee for the Prevention of Child Abuse
Chicago, Illinois

Duane Thomas
Director and Associate Professor of Pediatrics, University Affiliated Faculty
University of Kansas Medical Center
Kansas City, Kansas

Barbara Thompson
State Superintendent, State Department of Public Instruction
Madison, Wisconsin

Michael D. Usdan
President, The Merrill-Palmer Institute
Detroit, Michigan

Raymond Vowell
Commission of Public Welfare, State Department of Public Welfare
Austin, Texas

Ellen Winston
Former U.S. Commissioner of Welfare
Raleigh, North Carolina

Education Commission of the States

Governor Otis R. Bowen, M.D.
Indiana
ECS Chairman, 1977-78

Warren G. Hill
Executive Director

Homer Elseroad, Director
Elementary/Secondary Education Department

C. D. Jones Jr., Director
Child Abuse Project

Phil Fox, Associate Director
Child Abuse Project

STATE OF KANSAS

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
State Capitol
Topeka

ROBERT F. BENNETT
Governor

March 31, 1978

The Honorable Otis R. Bowen, M. D.
Governor of the State of Indiana
State Capitol
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Dear Governor Bowen:

I am pleased to submit to the Steering Committee of the Education Commission of the States, the report of the National Advisory Committee on Child Abuse and Neglect. This Advisory Committee was appointed by the Education Commission in the Fall of 1975, when I accepted to serve as the Chairman. The Committee includes representatives of the executive, legislative and judicial branches of government (state and local); of fields of education, medicine, social work, law and education and of various national organizations.

The purpose of the Committee was to explore ways that American education can help prevent and remedy the abuse and neglect of children and to offer recommendations based on their findings to state and federal policy makers.

Child abuse and neglect is an urgent issue and the members of the Committee have devoted an enormous amount of energy in the development of this report. Since the inception of the Committee, we have met four times, giving careful review to a number of revisions of the report itself.

In transmitting this report to you and the Steering Committee, I take satisfaction both in the belief that it is an important contribution of ECS for policy and legislative development and in the hope that it will be widely disseminated to and used by the states and federal government in attempting to eliminate the tragic problems of child abuse and neglect.

Very sincerely,

Robert F. Bennett
Governor of Kansas

RFB:ma

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The National Advisory Committee on Child Abuse and Neglect is a prestigious, nonpartisan group, formed by the Education Commission of the States (ECS) in the autumn of 1975 to examine and make recommendations concerning education's role in ending the abuse and neglect of children. This report highlights what the advisory committee has done in its first two years and presents to education decision makers the committee's recommendations concerning legislation and policy.

The issues raised by the advisory committee are urgent and of national concern. They deal with nothing less than the well-being of children and the future of the family as a viable social unit. In considering these issues, members of the committee, who represent a wide range of professional fields and points of view, bring a wealth of experience that is unique to multidisciplinary groups.

The recommendations presented in this report are offered as suggested courses of action to four specific audiences: the federal government; the state governments; education-governing agencies at all levels, from local school boards to boards of higher education; and ECS. In these recommendations, several major themes are apparent. One is that funding should be decentralized, and states and localities given greater discretion in their use of funds. Another theme reflected in many of the recommendations is that direct services to children and families should be expanded. Special emphasis is given to prevention programs, particularly to education for parenthood. In addition, close to a third of the recommendations apply to the federal Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act. They were composed before the bills now in congressional subcommittee were drafted.

The recommendations to the federal government are to:

- Reauthorize the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act of 1974.
- Allocate not less than 75 percent of the appropriations under the Act for grants to the states to improve prevention and treatment programs.
- In future legislation, allocate additional resources for prevention programs, particularly for parenting education.
- Encourage the states to include parenting education in their plans for career education.
- Relax the requirements for state eligibility for grants under the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act.
- Allocate not less than 20 percent of the appropriations under the Act for research and resource and demonstration projects, and continue to fund successful programs until the state or locality can maintain them.

- Change the composition of the advisory board to the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect so that it includes representatives of grantee agencies, nonfederal agencies and the professions that are involved in prevention and treatment.

State governments are encouraged to:

- Increase their appropriations to child protective service agencies.
- Appropriate funds for training those persons required by law to report suspected child abuse and neglect.
- Convene meetings of representatives of state government, public and private service organizations and a broad range of professions in order to coordinate human services within each state.
- Enact legislation requiring the court to order, after a finding of neglect, that petitioners submit suitable plans for a dispositional order of treatment.
- Identify a resource center to provide technical assistance for developing and implementing parenting education programs, and provide that there be, for each child abuse or neglect case, a manager responsible for coordinating interagency services and accountable to the mandated child protection agency within the state.

The advisory committee recommends that education governing agencies:

- Adopt policies and procedures, coordinated with those of other human service organizations, for reporting suspected child abuse and neglect.
- Provide inservice training to school personnel who are expected to report suspected child abuse and neglect.
- Include information on responsible parenting and appropriate parenting behavior in curricula from elementary through continuing education programs.

The committee also suggests that ECS convene a meeting of representatives of the most influential education and political groups in the country in order to create greater awareness of the need for parenting education and to obtain statements of support for parenting education in the schools. ECS is also urged to provide a clearinghouse and coordinating service, or to assist another agency to assume this responsibility.

In addition to these 16 recommendations, the advisory committee opposes the use of physical and verbal punishment in the schools. One last proposal still under consideration is one suggesting the group further study the "home visitor" concept as a means of identifying the preventing abuse and neglect.

Education Commission of the States

The Education Commission of the States (ECS) is a nonprofit organization formed by interstate compact in 1966, the late James B. Conant, president emeritus of Harvard University, originally envisioned ECS in 1965 as a vehicle for bringing the political and education leadership of the states together to share information on issues of common concern and to develop nationwide policy alternatives for education. Unlike many academicians at the time, Conant recognized that the control of education is largely political, and that improved communication between educators and politicians is necessary for an enlightened education policy.

Today, ECS includes 46 states, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands as current members. Its goal is to improve education within states and communities, and its primary functions are directed toward this goal. One of its functions is to bring together politicians and educators along with people from all walks of life to develop a common language, talk about problems related to education and come up with solutions to these problems. Another is to provide specific technical assistance to states. In addition, ECS sponsors research activities and provides a clearinghouse of information on promising practices in education and develops alternative education policies and positions. It also represents the views of the states to the federal government.

Child Abuse and Neglect Project

Much of the actual work of ECS is done through its many projects. One of these is the Child Abuse and Neglect Project, which was established in 1975 as one of 16 resource projects funded by the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect, a unit of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW). The project focuses on what education can and should do about the problem of child abuse and neglect. Its goals are to (1) increase the awareness of education decision makers about the nature and magnitude of the problem of abuse and neglect; (2) seek out and recommend to policy makers the many possible ways American education can help prevent the problem; and (3) recommend legislative and policy alternatives that provide a broader and more comprehensive base within education for services to abused and neglected children and their families.

Among its various activities, the project provides basic information on child abuse and neglect as well as long-range technical assistance to state and local education agencies. It has prepared and distributed documents describing the current legal base of states' reporting statutes (i.e., laws governing the reporting of suspected child abuse and neglect to designated agencies). The project is providing technical assistance, information and consultation on policy and legislation to state and local policy makers. It is also working with major education and political organizations throughout the United States to develop and coordinate activities designed to raise educators' awareness of issues surrounding child abuse and neglect.

National Advisory Committee on Child Abuse and Neglect

The National Advisory Committee on Child Abuse and Neglect, which serves both ECS and the Child Abuse and Neglect Project, includes representatives of the executive, legislative and judicial branches of state and local governments; of fields such as education, medicine, social work and law; and of various organizations. Governor Robert F. Bennett of Kansas is chairman. A list of the members appears in the appendix.

The goals of the advisory committee are to explore ways that American education can help prevent and remedy the abuse and neglect of children, and to offer recommendations based on its findings to education policy makers. An added purpose is to show by its example that a group comprising such wide-ranging disciplines and perspectives — as do so many groups that attempt to deal with child abuse and neglect — can reach consensus on important and complex issues.

Since its inception, the advisory committee has held four two-day meetings, and its subcommittees have held additional sessions. At the full committee meetings, the members have examined a broad range of subjects: they have looked at child abuse as the product of a maladaptive society, studied a curriculum for school children on child abuse and neglect and discussed parenting education as a means of

prevention. In addition, the subcommittees have developed a series of recommendations and proposals addressed to federal and state governments, to the agencies that govern education, to ECS and to the advisory committee itself. Each of the 16 recommendations has been approved by the full committee; one proposal is still being considered.

The remainder of this report lists the recommendations and proposals of the advisory committee, including an explanation or rationale for each.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Congress should reaffirm its concern for neglected and abused children and their families by reauthorizing with appropriate amendments the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-247).

Child abuse and child neglect are complex problems, difficult to understand and even harder to manage. Their historical roots stretch back through centuries of infanticide for economic and religious reasons and whippings and floggings in the name of discipline.

Abuse and neglect are still common. Today, many thousands of children are physically and emotionally abused and neglected or sexually assulted by their parents, relatives and others charged with their care. The American Humane Association's Information Clearinghouse on Child Abuse and Neglect puts the number of official reports made in this country in 1975 at 294,796; data on the number of reports made in 1976 are far from complete, yet indicate that the 1975 figure has clearly been exceeded. Even when the data are complete, reporting statistics only hint at the magnitude of the problem, since child abuse and neglect are often not reported. Estimates go as high as two to four million cases in the United States each year.*

In 1973, before passing the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, Congress held lengthy hearings on the problem. It found that the resources needed to identify, treat and prevent child abuse and neglect were highly inadequate. All 50 states had laws requiring the reporting of suspected cases, but many of these laws provided only for the collection of information and not for the services needed by children and families. Even the collection of information was hampered by ambiguous definitions of abuse and neglect that varied from state to state. Treatment services were scarce and greatly overtaxed, and prevention programs were practically nonexistent. Even basic research into the nature and extent of the problem was primitive.

Obviously, no federal law or agency by itself can prevent child abuse and neglect or even directly help children and families. Prevention and treatment efforts have to be based within the community. But the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act has been a catalyst in enhancing state and local prevention and treatment programs. The Act directed the Secretary of HEW to establish the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect and provided funds and direction needed to strengthen local efforts to deal with the problem.

The National Center has two primary goals. The first is to improve our knowledge of the entire spectrum of issues related to child abuse and neglect — from its definition, causes and incidence to the roles of various people and agencies in treating and preventing the problem. Its second goal is to apply any knowledge gained to improve and expand prevention and treatment services.

Approximately 75 percent of the appropriations to the National Center has gone to research and demonstration projects — about 25 percent to research and 50 percent to demonstration. Approximately 10 percent has gone to grants to various states to initiate or improve their child protection programs. Another 10 percent has provided technical assistance for many kinds of prevention and treatment projects. The remaining 5 percent has supported the National Center's Information Clearinghouse, its various publications and miscellaneous activities.

The Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act has added greatly to what we know and are doing about child abuse and neglect. It has helped to coordinate legislative, treatment and prevention activities throughout the country. There is no doubt that children and families are receiving more and better help as a result of this law. To continue to provide needed help, the Act must be reauthorized. Several modifications are called for, however, to make it even more responsive to current problems and needs. Specific modifications are suggested in recommen-

*David G. Gil and John H. Noble, "Public Knowledge, Attitudes, and Opinions about Physical Child Abuse in the U.S.," *Child Welfare* 48, No. 7 (July 1969): 400-401.

dations in this section. In addition to these, the committee urges the federal government to cooperate in devising a means for informing appropriate officials and practitioners as to what projects have been funded and are operating at the state and local levels.

Not less than 75 percent of the appropriations under the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act for any fiscal year should be allocated for distribution to the states to develop, strengthen and carry out prevention and treatment programs.

The most pressing need identified by the states is for funds to promote and improve services designed to respond to reports of suspected neglect and abuse. Caseloads in child protective service (CPS) agencies — the agencies mandated in most states to investigate reports and provide treatment services — continue to rise each year, usually without any corresponding increase in staff. Protective service agencies are critically understaffed in many states. Additional funds are needed to recruit and train CPS caseworkers as well as to train doctors, psychiatrists, teachers, judges and the many other professionals involved in child abuse and neglect cases. (Training is discussed in more detail in the rationale for the second recommendation to state governments, page 10.)

At present, not more than 20 percent of the appropriations under the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act may be used for grants to the states. The advisory committee suggests that the priorities within the Act be rearranged so that the major portion of funds is allocated to the states for actual service programs.

As a means of strengthening families, future legislation should allocate additional resources for prevention programs, particularly for offering parenting education through elementary and secondary schools, continuing education and adult education programs and community school centers, and for establishing coordination between new services and other programs already existing in the community.

The best way to manage any problem is to prevent it. Prevention comes as a result of a genuine understanding of why a problem occurs. Until we learn how to keep a problem from occurring, we are trapped in a cycle of identifying cases and treating symptoms and then watching in frustration as new cases continue to appear.

With our growing understanding of child abuse and neglect, we are slowly learning how to prevent it. One thing we have learned is that many people in this country, including a significant number of those who abuse and neglect their children, know little about parenthood. The members of the advisory committee believe that extensive programs to teach people appropriate parenting skills will help strengthen families and eventually reduce the incidence of child abuse and neglect.

Children demand a great deal from their parents emotionally, physically and intellectually. It is difficult to be a good parent without knowing something, however intuitive, about child development. For example, when is it realistic to expect a baby to begin walking and talking? Or begin toilet training and weaning? At one time, this information came to parents informally through family, neighbors and friends. But today it is not uncommon for young couples to see their own families rarely, to know their neighbors only in passing and to have only childless friends. Many new parents have little idea what to do with or expect from a baby.

As our society becomes increasingly segregated by age and as average family size continues to shrink, the chances diminish greatly that each succeeding generation will pick up knowledge about child care and an understanding of children's development through informal means. Several authorities have noted that young adults in particular have grossly inaccurate expectations of children's abilities, and that their errors are always on the side of expecting abilities too

soon.* Such expectations invite conflict within the family, and sometimes, abuse.

Parenting (or parent) education includes any type of educational program designed to increase people's competence and self-esteem as parents.** Parenting education is available, mainly in some hospitals, from public health nurses and in some public schools. Some 32,000 7th- through 12th-grade students, for example, are participating in field tests of the *Exploring Childhood Program* which was developed by the Education Development Center in Cambridge, Mass., and funded jointly by HEW's Office of Child Development and Office of Education.

Education for parenthood shows promise as a strategy for preventing child abuse and neglect.*** To be effective as a prevention tool, parenting education should be available to anyone, from young children to adults of any age. Since it is particularly important to reach people before they become parents, it should become a compulsory part of the school curriculum. Young people should be taught to become good parents, just as they are taught history and math. For young children, parenting education could take a subliminal form, such as stories in readers describing how parents get along with their children and how they realistically handle crises. Special efforts should be made to reach, in particular, the child who has been abused, since it is known that the abused child often becomes an abuser of children in later life.

As children mature, their parenting education could become more formal. They could learn about the emotional as well as the practical aspects of parenthood: how to feed a baby and change diapers, how to discipline children without endangering them, what to expect of children at particular developmental stages. Because of the close relationship between parenting and mental health in all of its aspects, parents need to learn to develop a positive self-concept about being parents, to cope with crises and to exercise self-control. While much of the practical information about parenting changes from decade to decade, other kinds of information remain constant, such as the importance of loving young children, of giving verbal responses, of providing physical contact and adequate health care and of assuring predictability and stability in children's lives. However, no "cookbook" curriculum could work. Parenting education cannot be effective unless it allows for differences in parents' needs, customs and beliefs.

Parenting education should also be more readily available to adults. It should be offered through adult education and continuing education programs, community colleges and community school centers. One aspect of parenting education should be to help people learn where they can go when they need help, such as mental health centers and other community resources. Parenting information could be distributed to target groups, and informational materials could be developed in languages other than English.

Widespread programs to teach people how to become better parents will probably not by themselves eradicate child abuse and neglect, but they should certainly diminish the problem.

*Bettye Caldwell, transcript of meeting of ECS National Advisory Committee on Child Abuse and Neglect, Dec. 4, 1976, p. 12

**ECS Child Abuse and Neglect Project, *Education for Parenthood: A Primary Prevention Strategy for Child Abuse and Neglect*, Report No. 93 (Denver: Education Commission of the States, 1976), p. 2.

****Ibid.*, p. 3.

The Office of Education should encourage states to include parenting education in their plans for career education.

The advisory committee believes that every avenue to promote responsible parenthood should be used. Encouraging states to include parenting education in their plans for career education is a relatively simple but essential step. By doing so, the Office of Education would not only give many more people an opportunity to learn about parenting, but would also promote the concept that parenthood is an important career for everyone who has a family.

The requirements for state eligibility for grants under the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act should be relaxed. Specifically, it is suggested that the phrase in Section 4(b) (2) of the Act — reading, "In order for a State to qualify for assistance under this subsection, such State shall . . ." — be modified by changing "shall" to "should substantially." It is further suggested that Section 3 — which reads, "For purposes of this Act the term 'child abuse and neglect' means . . ." — be modified by changing "means" to "may include."

In line with the second recommendation made to the federal government (page 6) — that not less than 75 percent of the funds appropriated under the Act be allocated for grants to states — it is essential that states be allowed to qualify more readily for these grants. At present, the Act permits the National Center to spend up to 20 percent of its funds for state grants, but it also sets up stringent qualifications that require most states to make substantial changes in their laws and administrative procedures in order to receive these grants. Consequently, only about 10 percent of the National Center's funds has gone into grants to individual states. In the first year after the Act was passed, only two states were eligible for funding; the next year, 16 were eligible; and in 1976, another 12 states were recommended as being able to receive grants.

In its present form, the Act directs funds to the states that have the most highly developed programs and denies them to the states whose child protection programs seem most in need of financial help. The suggested changes in phrasing should be regarded as a relaxing of criteria to permit more rapid development of services in order to meet children's needs for immediate help — help that perhaps is now denied them in states where prevention and treatment programs are not sufficiently funded.

Not less than 20 percent of the appropriations under the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act for any fiscal year should be allocated for grants to institutions of higher learning or to private, nonprofit organizations to fund research and resource and demonstration projects. Programs that are successful should continue to be funded until the state or local government can make adequate financial provision for their maintenance.

It is important that the Act continue to support research, demonstration, and resource center activities, but with more careful screening of proposed projects in order to insure their relevance and prevent duplication.

Over the first three years of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, the largest part of the appropriated funds went to research and demonstration. Our need for the kinds of information these projects generate is still great, but the immediate priority is to provide needed services — to translate the knowledge gained from several years of research and demonstration into actual service programs. We are not suggesting that further research and demonstration be abandoned, but that the immediate need for expanded services be balanced against the continuing need for studies. Research and demonstration activities should now be funded more selectively, with greater emphasis placed on the quality of projects funded and continued support provided to those that prove worthwhile.

A reasonable sum should be allocated under the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to support, over the next three years, the activities of an advisory board, appointed by the Secretary of HEW and composed of 25 persons. The board would meet at least twice a year and would provide an annual report to the Secretary. Its function would be to advise and assist the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect in coordinating its programs under the Act and in developing federal standards and guidelines for child abuse and neglect programs. The board would include eight persons from projects funded by the National Center and 17 others knowledgeable about

child abuse and neglect and representing the various disciplines involved in prevention and treatment. Membership would extend for the life of the Act, but in no event would it extend for longer than three years.

The members of the present advisory board, which was created by the Act in 1974, represent only federal agencies — specifically, the Departments of HEW, Justice, Labor, Defense, the Interior, Agriculture, and Housing and Urban Development. Its composition bars other informed persons and groups from contributing to the National Center's work. By including representatives of grantee agencies, nonfederal agencies and the many disciplines involved in prevention and treatment, the suggested changes enlarge the scope and diversity of the board and should enrich its contribution to the National Center.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO STATE GOVERNMENTS

State legislatures should provide adequate funds for the agencies designated by law to receive and investigate reports of abuse and neglect and provide services to reported families.

Every state has legislation that requires the reporting of suspected child abuse and neglect, although state legislatures have generally not provided enough funds to fulfill the intent and purpose of these reporting laws. As reporting laws become stronger, state and county child protective service agencies tend to find their responsibilities and caseloads steadily increasing, while their budgets stay relatively constant or decline. State reporting laws have been greatly improved over the past several years. Many now for the first time provide the legislative base needed to give real protection to children and concrete help to families. What is needed is to build on this base, to give CPS agencies the personnel and other resources they need to provide protection and help. In effect, this means giving child abuse and neglect a higher priority among issues being addressed at the state level.

State legislatures should appropriate funds to initiate and support programs for training those persons required by law to report suspected child abuse and neglect.

Child abuse reporting laws require target groups of professionals who regularly come in contact with children to report conditions that they suspect might be the result of abuse or neglect. These groups of professionals have grown in every state as reporting laws are amended. As a means for identifying children who need protection, these laws are only as effective as the cooperation and understanding of the persons they mandate to report. It is essential to broaden these professionals' awareness of the problem of child abuse and neglect as well as their understanding of their obligation to report. But so far, little money has gone to support the costs of such training.

Even thoroughly qualified professionals usually need additional training to deal adequately with cases of abuse and neglect. Educators, doctors, nurses, police and others whose work brings them in close contact with children need to be sensitized to the signs of actual or potential abuse and neglect. They have to know what they are required to do if they suspect that a child has been abused or neglected, and they need to understand the importance of reporting, the legitimate roles of other professionals and the need for cooperation among all those who would attempt to help a family.

Training can take many forms. One form that has proved successful is the workshop or conference that brings together people from a range of professions. This kind of multidisciplinary training was provided through one federal program to about 1,700 people during fiscal 1976. Each training conference lasted five days and included professionals from child protection, health, law, education and other fields, as well as paraprofessionals and private citizens. Each session emphasized, among other things, coordination among professionals from different fields and the development of multidisciplinary skills. Conferences such as these and other forms of training will have to be developed and conducted in communities and states if our reporting laws are to be truly effective.

To coordinate human services within the state, each governor should convene meetings of representatives of the executive, legislative and judicial branches of state government, public and private agencies and institutions, and the many professions and paraprofessions involved in abuse

and neglect cases. A range of representatives from each group should be invited, including top-level officials, practitioners and interested citizens.

Abuse and neglect are problems that cannot be handled by one discipline or agency alone. A single case may involve social workers from a hospital and the child protective service agency, a public assistance caseworker, one or more doctors, a psychiatrist or psychologist, both hospital and school nurses, police, lawyers, a juvenile court judge, the child's teachers and any number of other people. Needed services may include medical and psychiatric care, individual or group therapy or counseling; a parent self-help group; day care or babysitting, sometimes on an emergency basis; family planning; the services of homemakers, visiting public health nurses or parent aides; parenting education; foster placement of the children; job counseling and graining; financial assistance; and the provision of transportation and housing. To coordinate these people and services means to have them work together as a system, like links forming a chain. But at present, the services available in many states and communities look more like unconnected links. As the family is referred from agency to agency, each responsible for a particular service, responsibility passes from one person to another and often no one is responsible for overseeing the process and insuring that the family actually receives help.

Governor's conferences to coordinate the services needed in cases of abuse and neglect have been held in Alaska, Indiana, Kansas, Oregon and West Virginia. The advisory committee recommends that other states follow the example of these five.

The composition of these meetings is important. They must include the state's top political leaders, since only those at the policy levels with maximum political leverage can coordinate fragmented human services. At the same time, the participation of practitioners from each discipline is essential; only they can tell policy makers about the needs of themselves and their clients. The governor's conference in West Virginia provided a useful forum for these different points of view. On the morning of the third and final day, commissioners were asked to define the roles of their respective public agencies, and spokesmen for private agencies were asked to do the same. In the afternoon, the conference participants were divided into groups, each representing all the major disciplines, to discuss their personal views of their agencies' roles as compared to the views aired that morning. Although, according to one participant, the day saw some "bloodletting" and headknocking," the conference proved highly successful.

Educators may find these meetings particularly valuable. Until two or three years ago, the schools were largely overlooked as a resource for identifying and preventing child abuse and neglect. Education's role in these cases was even ignored in the literature. For a 1975 paper, Donald Kline and Mark Hopper thoroughly reviewed 475 articles and 20 books discussing child abuse; they found that only 53 articles referred to the need for teacher and school involvement and that even these references were general and brief.*

But as we have learned more about the problem, the importance of educators in identifying and preventing child abuse and neglect has become increasingly obvious. Even just five years ago, for instance, our attention was on battered and neglected babies; few people thought that abused and neglected children could be found in any significant numbers in schools. Today, more than half of all reports of child abuse and neglect involve children of school age.

But education is still in a quandary as far as child abuse and neglect is concerned. On one hand, the schools can help deal with the problem in ways that no other institution can. Teachers, in close daily contact with children for years, are in a unique position to spot problems in children. When there are problems, school personnel often arrange for help by providing direct or referral services. No other agency or profession touches the lives of families with children in so many ways for so long a period of time. Unlike health and welfare agencies, which are largely crisis-oriented, the schools allow their staffs to have sustained relationships with families. In addition, because of compulsory educa-

*Donald F. Klein and Mark Hopper, *Child Abuse: An Integration of the Literature and a Concept Analysis, with Recommendations for Educational Research* (Department of Special Education, Utah State University, January 1975).

tion laws, the schools can provide for prevention programs a mass (indeed captive) population that no other institution can generate.

On the other hand, child abuse and neglect is only one of many problems that education is in an ideal position to deal with and help prevent. There is a growing feeling both within and outside the education profession that the schools, with their increasingly limited resources, cannot attempt to be all things to all people. Those who hold this view maintain that schools should return to the basics of education and should no longer be expected to bear the economic and emotional burdens of social responsibilities that other agencies are better equipped to handle.

These arguments are important. Despite their unique potential, school personnel cannot be expected to assume responsibilities that neither their budgets nor their training equip them for. This is particularly true as long as their involvement in child abuse and neglect cases remains amorphous and open-ended. But because educators are required by law to report suspected child abuse and neglect, they cannot ignore the problem. The advisory committee believes that if the role of the schools in each state were more clearly defined and the responsibilities of educators made more explicit, education would be more likely to reach its full potential as a resource to help abused and neglected children. The governor's conferences recommended here may be a means to this end.

An organization or agency should be clearly identified in each state or community as the focal point for providing technical assistance for developing and implementing parenting education programs; moreover, in order to provide the most effective services to families and children involved in child abuse and neglect situations, each case should have a manager responsible for coordinating interagency services and accountable to the mandated child protection agency within the state.

To initiate and carry out a program of parenting education, various steps are involved, and many resources are needed. First, a concept of the program is needed: What are its purposes and goals? Who is its audience? What will be taught? And what form will the information take? Materials must then be prepared — a curriculum developed and books and audiovisual materials obtained — and teachers have to be trained. For each school and institution to develop its own parenting education program, the process would be lengthy, expensive and redundant.

Throughout this century, attempts have been made to provide parenting education in the United States. Institutions planning to set up a parenting education program today should have access to the many instructional materials that are available as well as to technical assistance in adapting existing materials to their particular needs.

This recommendation — that resource centers for parenting education be identified in every state or community — is based on two assumptions: (1) that any institution attempting to set up a parenting education program should have technical assistance readily available, and (2) that to provide this help, a new agency need not be created. Any number of existing agencies, such as a state's department of education or social services, could house a resource center. These resource centers need not be elaborate. They would be responsible for providing only technical assistance and service; their purpose would basically be to direct people to existing materials and other kinds of help.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO EDUCATION-GOVERNING AGENCIES

The recommendations in this section are addressed to agencies governing public or private school systems at all levels of organization, including state boards and departments of education, boards of higher education and teacher-training institutions, and local school boards.

State and local education agencies should carry out their obligation to comply with reporting laws and provide resources to insure compliance. In particular, all education agencies and governing bodies, both public and private, are urged to adopt policies and procedures that are coordinated with those of other human service organizations for reporting suspected child abuse and neglect.

As explained in the rationale for the third recommendation to state governments (page 11), educators have not only tremendous potential to help abused and neglected children, but also the legal obligation to do so.

There are many steps education agencies can take to help insure compliance with state reporting laws. Probably the simplest yet most important step is to adopt a policy regarding child abuse and neglect and procedures for implementing it. The ECS booklet, *Education Policies and Practices Regarding Child Abuse and Neglect*, which includes guidelines on developing and executing effective policies, defines a policy regarding child abuse and neglect as "a commitment by the school (or other education group or institution) to cooperate with other agencies and professions in identification, treatment and prevention programs."* The purpose of such a policy is to help protect endangered children.

An effective policy would spell out for school personnel their legal responsibilities and immunities with respect to reporting and would inform the community that educators are obliged to report suspected abuse and neglect, including any that might occur within the school setting itself. In essence, the policy gives those in education the information they need to make a report and to allay their fears that by reporting they might be overstepping their responsibility and jeopardizing their jobs. But a child abuse and neglect policy can include much more than particulars about reporting. In it, a school system can articulate its responsibilities with regard to child abuse and neglect, such as its commitment to cooperate with community efforts, to provide training or to conduct public awareness programs. In fact, the process of setting down a clear policy can itself give new focus to how a school can help abused and neglect children, and might even encourage schools to do more.

*ECS Child Abuse and Neglect Project, *Education Policies and Practices Regarding Child Abuse and Neglect and Recommendations for Policy Development*, Report No. 85 (Denver: Education Commission of the States, 1976), p. 13.

School personnel who are expected to identify and report suspected child abuse and neglect should receive inservice training.

The importance of training to help professionals understand their obligation to report is discussed in the rationale for the second recommendation to state governments (page 10).

Curricula from elementary through continuing education programs should be reviewed, and instruction on responsible parenting and appropriate parenting behavior should be included.

The need for parenting education is explained in the rationale for the first recommendation to the first recommendation to the federal government (page 5).

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE EDUCATION COMMISSION OF THE STATES

ECS should convene a meeting of representatives of the American Association of School Administrators, Council of Chief State School Officers, National Education Association, National Association of State Boards of Education, National Congress of Parents and Teachers, National School Boards Association, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and other education groups and semiprofessional and political organizations in order to create greater awareness of the urgent need for parenting education and to obtain statements of support for parenting education in the schools. In addition, since there is a need for a clearinghouse on the growing body of information and material with regard to education for parenting that is readily accessible to practitioners and the general public, ECS is urged to provide such a coordinating service or to assist another agency to assume this responsibility.

Major change generally comes slowly to any institution, and the schools are no exception. The endorsement of the most influential education and political groups in the country will hasten the addition of parenting education to school curricula. (See the rationale for the third recommendation to the federal government, page 6, for a discussion of parenting education.)

RECOMMENDATION ON CORPORAL PUNISHMENT

The ECS National Advisory Committee on Child Abuse and Neglect opposes the use of physical and verbal punishment in the schools.

Discussing the efficacy of corporal punishment is much like debating the death penalty. Both issues are highly emotional, with people being either strong advocates or opponents. Those who approve of physical punishment within limits point out that while many people assume a relationship between corporal punishment and abuse, research has shown no such correlation. They say that teachers are hamstrung enough; to prohibit reasonable physical punishment as a last resort to maintaining discipline would be to end all hope of order in the classroom. Some states and communities have explicit guidelines on what constitutes reasonable physical punishment. Some require the permission of the principal before a teacher can strike a student, or require the presence of a witness who will insure that the teacher is not acting out of anger and specify where and how hard and with what the child may be hit. Should the punishment be more severe than these specified constraints, the family of the child can appeal to the courts. As recently as the spring of 1977, the U.S. Supreme Court upheld the right of public school officials to administer reasonable corporal punishment.

Others, however, feel that children are not for hitting under any circumstances. They say that although the law cannot stop parents from physically disciplining their own children (unless the actions can be considered abusive), corporal punishment inflicted by a third party can and should be prohibited. Those who hold this view believe it is particularly important to outlaw corporal punishment in schools; alternatives to punishment can and should be identified, disseminated and then employed in the school setting. To support this belief, they point out that parents tend to view teachers as competent authorities, whose behavior is to be emulated, and that the use of corporal punishment in schools, regardless of how it is administered, gives parents an excuse for hitting their children at home. Members of the committee maintain that, through the process of certifying people to staff the schools, it is readily possible to restrict educators' use of physical punishment against children. Striking a child could cause a teacher to lose his or her certification. Since, under compulsory education laws, the child and his family have essentially no choice regarding the public school teacher, certification is the state's way of attesting that a particular person is competent to teach.

Those on the committee who oppose corporal punishment ask: How can physical punishment of children be sanctioned by schools, which simultaneously attempt to teach children other values and other ways of dealing with human failings and weaknesses? If we permit corporal punishment in classrooms, are we not teaching children by example that it is permissible to use violence against others? Why do we maintain a system of punishment in our schools that has been eliminated even from our criminal justice system?

To make some sense of these two perspectives, it is important to keep in mind that, for the purposes of the advisory committee, corporal punishment refers to *any* form of physically inflicted punishment, whether "reasonable" such as a light paddling carefully administered in the principal's office, or "excessive" such as angry lashing out and striking a child in the head. All members of the committee were opposed to excessive physical and verbal punishment. Their disagreements concerned only the use and definition of "reasonable" physical punishment. The committee used a distinction that might be helpful to others considering the dilemma: "punishment is to exact retribution for an act committed, where discipline is merely to restrain someone for his own benefit or for the sake of others. The committee heartily endorses discipline but disapproves of punishment. The majority vote was to delete the word "excessive," thereby recommending the abolishment of all physical punishment. A strong minority opinion requested official recognition of their view as discussed above.

PROPOSAL STILL UNDER CONSIDERATION

The ECS National Advisory Committee on Child Abuse and Neglect should further study the concept of the "home visitor."

The advisory committee believes that it is a fundamental right of every child to have access to basic social and medical services. The "home visitor" concept may be a means to insuring this right.

From the time they leave the hospital after birth until they enter school, children in this country are almost totally dependent on their parents for access to social and medical services. Most parents provide for their children's basic needs, but some do not. It has been suggested that to safeguard the welfare of all children and guarantee them access to the fundamental services they need, the United States should implement a nationwide program of home visitors, similar to the "child health visitor" and "family health visitor" programs in most European countries. This country does have some early periodic screening and testing programs in a few areas but a much larger and more concerted effort is needed.

Many European child health visitors are trained nurses, and their focus is largely on mother-crafting skills. But there are differences between health visitor programs in different countries. In France, for example, a child health visitor goes to see each new mother soon after delivery, and thereafter visits the family's home four times a year and medically examines the child. The Dutch version of this program requires parents to bring their children to well-baby clinics, four times the first year, with the number of visits decreasing each year until the child enters school.

Several variations of this concept have been proposed for the United States. Beyond its recongized value of insuring basic medical and social services to children, its advocates see the home visitor program as an invaluable tool for identifying and preventing child abuse and neglect. It is a particularly appealing preventive device. The home visitor could not only help identify problems that suggest a potential for later abuse or neglect, but could also help these families obtain services to alleviate the conditions that may lead to child maltreatment.

For approximately $2 billion a year, a nationwide home visitor program could be set up and operated. This represents approximately the same cost per year as day care; but, while day care reaches only about 20 to 25 percent of the children in this country, the home visitor program would reach all children and families. Pilot programs are operating in several counties in North Carolina as well as in Kansas and Colorado, and a statewide system is about to be adopted in California.

The advisory committee has opted to study the home visitor concept further. There are three basic issues that need to be explored: (1) Do children have the right of equal access to basic services in society? (2) If so, what is the most appropriate vehicle to provide such access? (3) Regardless of what vehicle is used, what happens if parents object to their child receiving needed basic services? Should program be voluntary or compulsory?

ECS STEERING COMMITTEE
1977-78

Chairman
Otis R. Bowen, M.D., Governor of Indiana

Chairman-Elect
Dixy Lee Ray, Governor of Washington

Vice Chairman
Clarence W. Blount, State Senator, Maryland

Treasurer
Shiro Amioka, University of Hawaii

Members
David Boren, Governor of Oklahoma
Hugh L. Carey, Governor of New York
Edwin Edwards, Governor of Louisiana
James Longley, Governor of Maine
Scott M. Matheson, Governor of Utah
Richard A. Snelling, Governor of Vermont
Hunter B. Andrews, State Senator, Virginia
John M. Barker, State Senator, Idaho
Gilbert E. Bursley, State Senator, Michigan
Joseph C. Harder, State Senator, Kansas
Roger C. Hill, Senator, Virgin Islands
Sid McDonald, State Senator, Alabama
James M. Waddell Jr., State Senator, South Carolina
Adrienne Bailey, Member, State Board of Education, Illinois
William P. Bittenbender, Chairman, State Board of Education, New Hampshire
Carrol E. Burchinal, Director, State Board of Vocational Education, North Dakota
Anne Campbell, Commissioner of Education, Nebraska
Carlos E. Chardon, Secretary of Education, Puerto Rico
Calvin Hart, Principal, New York Diana Sands Intermediate School 147, Bergenfield, N.J.
Sam H. Ingram, Commissioner of Education, Tennessee
Paul Parks, Secretary of Educational Affairs, Massachusetts
Pat Pascoe, University of Denver, Colorado
Doris D. Ray, Fairbanks North Star School District, Alaska
Stanley F. Redeker, Past President, Board of Regents, Iowa
Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner of Education, Rhode Island
Robert G. Schrader, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Wyoming
Barbara S. Thompson, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Wisconsin
E. T. York Jr., Chancellor, State University System, Florida

Advisory Members
Jerry Apodaca, Governor of New Mexico
George D. Busbee, Governor of Georgia
Ella T. Grasso, Governor of Connecticut
Norman L. Merrell, State Senator, Missouri
Jeanette F. Reibman, State Senator, Pennsylvania
John Stull, State Senator, California
Jo Graham Foster, State Representative, North Carolina
Peter X. Fugina, State Representative, Minnesota
Terry Mann, State Representative, Kentucky
Marlin L. Brockette, Commissioner of Education, Texas
Novice G. Fawcett, President Emeritus, Ohio State University
Catherine J. Gill, Elementary School Principal, Little Rock, Ark.
Sue Healy, South Junior High School, Rapid City, S.D.
Albert H. Jones Jr., President, State Board of Education, Delaware
Roy E. Lieuallen, Chancellor of Higher Education, Oregon
Charles H. Wagoner, Past President, West Virginia School Boards Association

The Education Commission of the States is a nonprofit organization formed by interstate compact in 1966. Forty-six states, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands are now members. Its goal is to further a working relationship among governors, state legislators and educators for the improvement of education. This report is an outcome of one of many commission undertakings at all levels of education. The commission offices are located at Suite 300, 1860 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colorado 80295.

It is the policy of the Education Commission of the States to take affirmative action to prevent discrimination in its policies, programs and employment practices.